



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,098	06/04/2001	Wei William Wu	5043P010	6034

8791 7590 04/25/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

SAM, PHIRIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2661

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/874,098

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

Phirin Sam

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities:

**Regarding claim 8**, this claim seems to depend on claim 6 (apparatus) and where claim 1 (method). Therefore, the appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,838,924).

Anderson et al. discloses the invention (**claims 1 and 3-5**) as claimed including a method comprising:

- (a) fixing a logical identifier for a signal line at an egress interface (see Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 52-62, col. 5, lines 38-50).
- (b) mapping a first physical identifier for a first physical signal line to the logical identifier (see Fig. 11, col. 10, lines 41-48).
- (c) remapping a second physical identifier for a second physical signal line to the logical identifier responsive to a line failure on the first physical signal line (see Fig. 10, col. 10, lines 19-40).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,838,924) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,353,593).

**Regarding claim 2**, Anderson et al. does not disclose mapping comprises writing to a cross connect table and wherein remapping comprises rewriting the cross connect table. However, Chen et al. discloses mapping comprises writing to a cross connect table and wherein remapping comprises rewriting the cross connect table (see Fig. 2, elements 72 and 74, col. 5, lines 36-56). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine mapping comprises writing to a cross connect table and wherein remapping comprises rewriting the cross

Art Unit: 2661

connect table teaching by Chen et al. with Anderson et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to prevent the data drop. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chen et al. and Anderson et al. to obtain the invention as specified in the claim 2.

4. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Afanador et al. (U.S. Patent 6,317,426) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,353,593).

**Regarding claims 6-9, Afanador et al. discloses an apparatus comprising:**

- (a) a bus interface (see Fig. 1, elements 41 and 46, col.
- (b) an ingress time slot interchange (ITSI) module (see Fig. 1, element 41 and 46, col. 4, lines 4-6, 11-15).
- (c) a switch fabric coupled to the ITSI module (see Fig. 1, elements 46 and 48, col. 4, lines 11-16).
- (d) an egress time slot interchange (ETSI) module having a plurality of inputs (see Fig. 1, elements 51, 240, col. 4, lines 17-19).

Afanador et al. does not disclose each input assigned a logical identifier which remains fixed after initialization and a translation module to translate an incoming signal identifier to one of the logical identifiers independent of a physical line on which the signal is received. However, Chen et al. discloses each input assigned the logical identifier which remains fixed after initialization (see Figs. 1-2, col. 5, lines 43-56) and the translation module to translate the incoming signal identifier to one of the logical identifiers independent of the physical line on which the signal is received (see Figs. 1-2, col. 3, lines 57-67, col. 4, lines 1-7). At the time of the invention, it would have been

Art Unit: 2661

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the input assigned the logical identifier and the translation module teaching by Chen et al. with Afanador et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to identify the receiving data to prevent from drop out or congestion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chen et al. and Afanador et al. to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 6-9.

*Conclusion*

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to the examiner, Phirin Sam whose telephone number is (703) 308 – 9294. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday for 8:30AM – 5:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W. Olms can be reached on (703) 305 – 4703. The fax number for this group is (703) 872 – 9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 – 4700.



Phirin Sam  
Patent Examiner  
April 16, 2003